arXiv:1506.05627v3 [math.PR] 11 Apr 2017

A pathwise inference method for the parameters of diffusion terms

Nikolai Dokuchaev

Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Curtin University,

GPO Box U1987, Perth, 6845 Western Australia

Submitted: June 19, 2015, Revised: April 11, 2017

Abstract

We consider inference of the parameters of the diffusion term for Cox-Ingersoll-Ross and similar processes with a power type dependence of the diffusion coefficient from the underlying process. We suggest some original pathwise estimates for this coefficient and for the power index based on an analysis of an auxiliary continuous time complex valued process generated by the underlying real valued process. These estimates do not rely on the distribution of the underlying process and on a particular choice of the drift. Some numerical experiments are used to illustrate the feasibility of the suggested method.

Key words: diffusions processes, power index, Cox-Ingersoll-Ross process, CKLS model, pathwise estimation.

Mathematical Subject Classification (2010): 91G70 65C30, 65C50, 65C60

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider inference of the diffusion term for Cox-Ingersoll-Ross and similar processes with a power type dependence of the diffusion coefficient from the underlying process. These processes are important for applications; in particular, they are used for interest rate models and for volatility models in finance; see, e.g., Heston (1993), Gibbons and Ramaswamy (1993), Lewis (2000), Zhou (2001), Carr and Sun (2007), Andersen and Lund (1997), Gourieroux and Monfort (2013), Fergusson and Platen (2015), Hin and Dokuchaev (2016), and the bibliography therein. Estimation of the parameters for these models was widely studied; see e.g. Gibbons and Ramaswamy (1993), Andersen and Lund (1997), Kessler (1997), Sørensen (2000),

Zhou (2001), Fan *et al* (2003), Ait-Sahalia (1996), De Rossi (2010), Gourieroux and Monfort (2013).

We readdress the problem of inference for these processes. We suggests a new method that allows to obtain pathwise estimates of the diffusion coefficient and the power index represented as explicit functions defined on an auxiliary continuous time complex valued process generated by the underlying real valued process. An attractive feature of the method is that it not require to estimate neither parameters of the drift nor the distributions of the underlying process. In particular, one does not need to know the shape of the likelihood function. In addition, our method allows to consider models with a large number parameters for the drift; therefore, it allows to cover cases where the Maximum Likelihood method is not feasible due to high dimension. This is especially beneficial for financial application where the trend for the prices is usually difficult to estimate since it is overshadowed by a relatively large volatility. Since the drift is excluded from the analysis, our method does not lead to an estimation of the drift. However, this could be a useful supplement to the existing more comprehensive methods such as described in Gibbons and Ramaswamy (1993), Andersen and Lund (1997), Sørensen (2000), Zhou (2001), Fan *et al* (2003), Ait-Sahalia (1996), De Rossi (2010), Gourieroux and Monfort (2013), and Kessler (1997). These works used estimation of the parameters for drift term; on the other hand, the method discussed in the present paper allows to bypass this task.

Feasibility an robustness of the suggested method is illustrated with some numerical experiments.

2 The model

Let $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$ and $T \in (\theta, +\infty)$ be given. We are also given a standard complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ and a right-continuous filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in[\theta,T]}$ of complete σ-algebras of events. In addition, we are given an one-dimensional Wiener process $w(t)|_{t\in[\theta,T]}$, that is a Wiener process such that $w(\theta) = 0$ adapted to $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ and such that $\mathcal{F}_t$ is independent from $w(s) - w(q)$ if $t \geq s > q \geq \theta$.

Consider a continuous time one-dimensional random process $y(t)|_{t\geq\theta}$ such that $y(\theta) > 0$ and

$$dy(t) = f(y(\cdot), t)dt + \sigma(t)y(t)^{\gamma}dw(t), \qquad t \in (\theta, T). \tag{2.1}$$

Here $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, $\sigma(t)$ is a bounded $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted process, $f(s, t) : C([\theta, T]) \times [\theta, T] \to \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable function such that $f(s, t)$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted for any $s \in C([\theta, T])$, and that $f(s_1, t) =$

$f(s_2,t)$ if $(s_1-s_2)|_{[\theta,t]}\equiv 0$. In addition, we assume that, for any $\delta>0$, $|f(s_1,t)-f(s_2,t)|\le c_1\|s_1-s_2\|_{C([0,T])}$ and $|f(s,t)|\le c_2(\|s\|_{C([\theta,T])}+1)$ for some constants $c_k=c_k(\delta)>0$ a.s. (almost surely) a for all $t\in[\theta,T]$, $s_1,s_2\in C([\theta,T])$, such that $\inf_{t\in[\theta,T],k=1,2}s_k(t)>\delta$.

Under these assumptions, there exists a Markov time τ with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ with values in $(\theta,T]$ such that there exists an unique almost surely continuous solution $y(s)|_{s\in[\theta,\tau]}$ such that $\inf_{t\in[\theta,\tau]}y(s)>0$.

Examples of applications in financial modelling

The assumptions on the process y allows to use it for a variety of financial models. In particular, the assumption on the drift coefficient f allows to consider a path depending evolution such as described by equations with delay; see some examples in Stoica (2005) and Luong and Dokuchaev (2016).

The assumptions on the diffusion coefficient allow to cover many important financial models. In particular, the so-called Cox-Ingersoll-Ross process is used for the interest rate models and the volatility of stock prices (Heston (1993)). This equation has the form

$$dy(t)=a[b-y(t)]dt+\sigma y(t)^{1/2}dw(t),\qquad t>0, \tag{2.2}$$

where $a>0$, $b>0$, and $\sigma>0$ are some constants.

A more general model introduced in Chan et al. (1992)

$$dy(t)=a[b-y(t)]dt+\sigma y(t)^{\gamma}dw(t),\qquad t>0, \tag{2.3}$$

is called a Chan-Karolyi-Longstaff-Sanders (CKLS) model in the econometric literature; see e.g. Iacus (2008). This equation (2.1) with $\gamma=2/3$ is also used for volatility modelling; see, e.g., Carr and Sun (2007) and Lewis (2000).

3 The main result

Up to the end of the paper, we assume conditions for f and σ formulated above holds. We assume below that τ is a Markov time with respect $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ such that $\tau\in(\theta,T]$ a.s. and that $\inf_{s\in[\theta,\tau]}y(s)>0$ a.s.. In particular, one can select $\tau=T\wedge\inf\{s>\theta:\ y(s)\le M\}$ for any given $M\in(0,y(\theta))$.

Our main tool for estimation of the pair (σ,γ) will be provided by the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 *For any $h \in [0,1]$,*

$$\int_\theta^\tau y(s)^{2(\gamma-h)}\sigma(s)^2 ds = 2\log|Y_h(\tau)| \quad a.s., \tag{3.1}$$

where $Y_h(s)$ is a complex-valued process defined for $s \in [\theta,\tau]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &dY_h(s) = iY_h(s)\frac{dy(s)}{y(s)^h}, \quad s \in (\theta,\tau), \\ &Y_h(\theta) = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

In (3.2), $i = \sqrt{-1}$ is the imaginary unit.

Corollary 3.1 *(a) We have that*

$$\int_\theta^\tau \sigma(s)^2 ds = 2\log|Y_\gamma(\tau)| \quad a.s.. \tag{3.3}$$

(b) If $\sigma(t) = \sigma$ is constant, then, for any $h \in [0,1]$,

$$\sigma^2 = 2\left(\int_\theta^\tau y(s)^{2(\gamma-h)}ds\right)^{-1}\log|Y_h(\tau)| \quad a.s.. \tag{3.4}$$

4 Applications of Theorem 3.1 to estimation of (γ,σ)

Up to the end of this paper, we assume that $\sigma(t) \equiv \sigma$ is an unknown positive constant.

We present below estimates of (σ,γ) based on available samples $\{y(t_k)\}$, where $t_k \in [\theta, \tau\wedge T]$, such that $t_{k+1} = t_k + \delta$ for $k = m_0, m_0+1, ..., m-1$, $\delta = (\tau\wedge T - \theta)/(m-m_0)$, $t_{m_0} = \theta$ and $t_m = \tau\wedge T$. In this setting, $y(t_k) > 0$ for $k = m_0, ..., m$.

For $h \in [0,1]$, let

$$\eta_{h,k} = \frac{y(t_k) - y(t_{k-1})}{y(t_{k-1})^h}.$$

Estimation of σ under the assumption that γ is known

Let us first suggest an estimate for σ under the assumption that γ is known.

Corollary 4.1 *For any $h \in [0,1]$, the value σ can be estimated as $\widetilde{\sigma}_{\gamma,h}$, where*

$$\widetilde{\sigma}^2_{\gamma,h} = \left(\delta\sum_{k=m_0+1}^m y(t_k)^{2(\gamma-h)}\right)^{-1}\sum_{k=m_0+1}^m \log(1+\eta^2_{h,k}). \tag{4.1}$$

Estimation of γ with excluded σ

It appears that Theorem 3.1 implies some useful properties of the process $Y_h(t)$ allowing to estimate γ in a setting with unknown constant σ.

Proposition 4.1 *For any $h_1, h_2 \in [0,1]$,*

$$\frac{\int_\theta^\tau y(s)^{2(\gamma-h_1)}ds}{\int_\theta^\tau y(s)^{2(\gamma-h_2)}ds} = \frac{\log|Y_{h_1}(\tau)|}{\log|Y_{h_2}(\tau)|} \quad a.s.. \tag{4.2}$$

Since calculation of $Y_{h_1}(\tau)$ and $Y_{h_2}(\tau)$ does not require to know the values of f, γ, and σ, property (4.2) allows to calculate γ as is shown below.

Corollary 4.2 *An estimate $\widehat{\gamma}$ of γ can be found as a solution of the equation*

$$\frac{\sum_{k=m_0+1}^m y(t_k)^{2(\gamma-h_1)}}{\sum_{k=m_0+1}^m y(t_k)^{2(\gamma-h_2)}} = \frac{\sum_{k=m_0+1}^m \log(1+\eta_{h_1,k}^2)}{\sum_{k=m_0+1}^m \log(1+\eta_{h_2,k}^2)}, \tag{4.3}$$

for any pair of pre-selected h_1 and h_2.

It can be noted that σ remains unused and excluded from the analysis for the method described in Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 4.2; respectively, this method does not lead to an estimate of σ.

Estimation of the pair (σ, γ)

Proposition 4.2 *The process*

$$\frac{1}{t\wedge\tau-\theta}\log|Y_\gamma(t\wedge\tau)| \tag{4.4}$$

is a.s. constant in $t \in [\theta, T]$.

Let

$$v_{h,k} = \log(1+\eta_{h,j}^2), \quad k = m_0+1, ..., m,$$

and

$$\bar{v}_h = \frac{1}{m-m_0}\sum_{j=m_0+1}^m v_{h,k}.$$

Corollary 4.3 *An estimate of γ can be found as the solution of the optimization problem*

$$\textit{Minimize} \quad \sum_{k=m_0+1}^{m} \left(v_{h,k} - \bar{v}_h\right)^2 \quad \textit{over} \quad h \in [0,1]. \tag{4.5}$$

In this case, σ can be estimated as

$$\widehat{\sigma} = \sqrt{\bar{v}_{\widehat{\gamma}}/\delta}. \tag{4.6}$$

where $\widehat{\gamma}$ is the estimate of γ obtained as a solution of (4.5).

Remark 4.1 *Corollary 4.3 allows the following modefication a special case of estimation of γ for the case where σ is a known constant σ: an estimate $\widehat{\gamma}$ of γ can be found as the solution of the optimization problem*

$$\textit{Minimize} \quad \sum_{k=m_0}^{m} \left(v_{h,k}/\delta - \sigma^2\right)^2 \quad \textit{over} \quad h \in [0,1].$$

5 Proofs

For $M \in (0, y(\theta))$, let $\tau_M = \tau \wedge \sup\{s \in [\theta, T] : \inf_{q \in [\theta, s]} y(q) \geq M\}$. Clearly,

$$\tau_M \to \tau \quad \text{as} \quad M \to 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{5.1}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The proof follows the idea of the proof of Lemma 3.2 from Dokuchaev (2014), where less general log-normal underlying processes were considered. Let $\widetilde{a}(t) = f(y(t), t)y(t)^{-h}$. We have, for any $M \in (0, y(\theta))$,

$$dY_h(t) = iY_h(t)[\widetilde{a}(t)dt + y(t)^{\gamma-h}\sigma(t)dw(t)], \quad t \in (\theta, \tau_M).$$

By the Ito formula again, for any $M \in (0, y(\theta))$,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_h(\tau_M) &= Y_h(\theta) \exp\left(i\int_\theta^{\tau_M} \widetilde{a}(s)ds - \frac{i^2}{2}\int_\theta^{\tau_M} y(s)^{2(\gamma-h)}\sigma(s)^2 ds + i\int_\theta^{\tau_M} y(s)^{\gamma-h}\sigma(s)dw(s)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(i\int_\theta^{\tau_M} \widetilde{a}(s)ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_\theta^{\tau_M} y(s)^{2(\gamma-h)}\sigma(s)^2 ds + i\int_\theta^{\tau_M} y(s)^{\gamma-h}\sigma(s)dw(s)\right) \quad \text{a.s..} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|Y_h(\tau_M)| = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_\theta^{\tau_M} y(s)^{2(\gamma-h)}\sigma(s)^2 ds\right) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

and

$$\int_\theta^{\tau_M} y(s)^{2(\gamma-h)}\sigma(s)^2 ds = 2\log|Y_h(\tau_M)| \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Hence (3.1) follows from (5.1). □

Proof of Corollary 3.1 follows immediately from Theorem 3.1. □

Proof of Corollary 4.1. Let $t_m = \tau_M$, $t_{m_0} = \theta$, and let $t_k = t_{m_0} + (k - m_0)\delta$ if $m_0 \le k \le m$. Let $\eta_{h,k}$ be defined by (4.1). The Euler-Maruyama time discretization of (3.2) leads to the stochastic difference equation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{Y}_h(t_k) = \mathcal{Y}_h(t_{k-1}) + i\mathcal{Y}_h(t_{k-1})\eta_{h,k}, \quad k \ge m_0 + 1,\\
&\mathcal{Y}_h(t_{m_0}) = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

(See, e.g., Kloeden and Platen (1992), Ch. 9). This equation can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{Y}_h(t_k) = \mathcal{Y}_h(t_{k-1})(1 + i\eta_{h,k}), \quad k \ge m_0 + 1,\\
&\mathcal{Y}_h(t_{m_0}) = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{Y}_h(t_m) = \prod_{k=m_0+1}^{m} (1 + i\eta_{h,k}).$$

Clearly,

$$|\mathcal{Y}_h(t_m)| = \prod_{k=m_0+1}^{m} |1 + i\eta_{h,k}| = \prod_{k=m_0+1}^{m} (1 + \eta_{h,k}^2)^{1/2},$$

and

$$\log|\mathcal{Y}_h(t_m)| = \sum_{k=m_0+1}^{m} \log[(1 + \eta_{h,k}^2)^{1/2}] = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=m_0+1}^{m} \log(1 + \eta_{h,k}^2). \tag{5.2}$$

Then (3.3) leads to estimate (4.1). □

Proof of Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.2 follows immediately from Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.1(b). □

Proof of Corollary 4.2 follows from the natural discretization of integration and (5.2). □

Proof of Corollary 4.3. It follows from (5.2) that the sequence $\{\log|\mathcal{Y}_h(t_k)|\}$ represents the discretization of the continuous time process $\log|Y_h(t \wedge \tau)|$ at points $t = t_k$; this process is linear in time for $h = \gamma$ and $2\log|Y_\gamma(t \wedge \tau)| \equiv (t \wedge \tau - \theta)\sigma^2$. Hence

$$2\log|Y_\gamma(t_{k+1})| - 2\log|Y_\gamma(t_k)| = \delta\sigma^2.$$

On the other hand, (5.2) implies that

$$2\log|\mathcal{Y}_h(t_{k+1})| - 2\log|\mathcal{Y}_h(t_k)| = v_{h,k}, \quad h \in [0,1].$$

This leads to an optimization problem

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{k=m_0+1}^{m} (v_{h,k}/\delta - c)^2 \quad \text{over} \quad h \in [0,1], \quad c > 0.$$

By the properties of quadratic optimization, this problem can be replaced by the problem

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{k=m_0+1}^{m} (v_{h,k}/\delta - \bar{v}_h)^2 \quad \text{over} \quad h \in (0,1]. \tag{5.3}$$

Then the proof follows. □

Proof of Remark 4.1 repeats the previous proof without optimization over c. □

6 Numerical experiments

To illustrate numerical implementation of the algorithms described above, we applied these algorithms for discretized Monte-Carlo simulations of some generalized version the Cox-Ingersoll-Ross process (2.2). We consider a toy example of a process with a large number of parameter. Presumably, estimation of all these parameters is not feasible due a high dimension for a method of moments or Maximum Likelihood Method.

We consider a process evolving as the following:

$$dy(t) = H\left(y(t), y(\max(t-\lambda,0))\right) dt + \sigma y(t)^{\gamma} dw(t), \qquad t > 0, \tag{6.1}$$

where

$$H(x,y) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left[F_k(x) + G_k(y)\right],$$
$$F_k(x) = a_k[b_k - x^{\nu_k+1/2}] + c_k\cos(d_k x + e_k), \quad G_k(x) = 0.1\,\widehat{a}_k[\widehat{b}_k - x^{\widehat{\nu}_k+1/2}],$$

The parameters $N, a_k, b_k, \nu_k, c_k, d_k, e_k, \widehat{a}_k, \widehat{b}_k, \widehat{e}_k, \nu_k, \widehat{\nu}_k, \lambda$ are randomly selected in each experiment. In particular, the integers N are selected randomly at the set $\{1,2,3,4,5\}$ with equal probability. The delay parameter λ has the uniform distribution on the interval $[0, 0.2]$. The parameters $a_k, b_k, \nu_k, c_k, d_k, e_k, \widehat{a}_k, \widehat{b}_k, \widehat{e}_k, \nu_k, \widehat{\nu}_k$ are uniformly distributed on the interval $[0,1]$.

For the Monte-Carlo simulation, we considered corresponding discrete time process $\{y(t_k)\}$ evolving as

$$y(t_{k+1}) = y(t_k) + H(y(t_k), y(t_{\max(k-\ell,0)})\delta + \sigma y(t_k)^\gamma \delta^{1/2}\, \xi_{k+1}, \quad k = 0, ..., n, \tag{6.2}$$

with mutually independent random variables ξ_k from the standard normal distribution $N(0, 1)$. Here $\delta = t_{k+1} - t_k = 1/n$ this corresponds to $[\theta, T] = [0, 1]$ for continuous time underlying model. The delay ℓ is the integer part of $\lambda(T - \theta)/(n + 1)$.

We considered $n \in \{52, 250, 10000, 20000\}$. For the financial applications, the choice of $n = 52$ corresponds to weekly sampling; the choice of $n = 250$ corresponds to daily sampling.

In the Monte-Carlo simulation trials, we considered random $y(t_{m_0})$ uniformly distributed on $[0.1, 10]$ and truncated paths $y(t_k)|_{m_0 \le k \le m}$, with the Markov stopping time $m = n \wedge \inf\{k : y(t_k) \le 0.001 y(t_{m_0})\}$. In this case, $y(t_k) > 0$ for $k = m_0, ..., m$. To exclude the possibility that $y(t_m) \le 0$ (which may happen for our discrete time process since the values of ξ_k are unbounded), we replace $y(t_m)$ defined by (6.2) by $y(t_m) = y(t_{m-1}) > 0$ every time when $m < n$ occurs. It can be noted that, for our choice of parameters, the occurrences of the event $m < n$ were very rare and have not an impact on the statistics.

We used 10,000 Monte-Carlo trials for each trial (i.e. for each entry in each of the tables 6.1-6.3 below). We found that enlarging the sample does not improve the results. Actually, the experiments with 5,000 trials or even 1,000 Monte-Carlo trials produced the same results.

The parameters of the errors obtained in these experiments are quite robust with respect to the change of other parameters as well.

We denote by $\mathbb{E}$ the sample means of the corresponding values over all Monte-Carlo simulation trials. For the estimates $(\widehat{\sigma}, \widehat{\gamma})$ of (σ, γ), we evaluated the root mean-squared errors (RMSE) $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\,|\widehat{\sigma} - \sigma|^2}$ and $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\,|\widehat{\gamma} - \gamma|^2}$, the mean errors $\mathbb{E}|\widehat{\sigma} - \sigma|$ and $\mathbb{E}\,|\widehat{\gamma} - \gamma|$, and the biases $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\sigma} - \sigma)$ and $\mathbb{E}\,(\widehat{\gamma} - \gamma)$.

In the experiment described below, we used $\sigma = 0.3$, $\gamma = 1/2$, and $\gamma = 0.6$.

Estimation of σ using Corollary 4.1

The numerical implementation of Corollary 4.1 requires to use the value γ. In other words, one have to use certain hypothesis about the value of γ, for instance, based on estimation of γ that was done separately. This setting leads to an error caused by miscalculation of γ.

To illustrate the dependence of the error for the estimate of σ from the error in the hypothesis on γ, we considered estimates for inputs simulated with $\gamma = 1/2$ and with different h.

Tables 6.1 (a),(b) show the parameters of the errors in the experiments described above for estimate (4.1) with different h and with $\gamma = 1/2$, for $\delta = 1/52$ and $\delta = 1/250$ respectively. Numerical experiments shows that these estimates are robust with respect to small errors for γ; however, the estimation error for σ caused by misidentification of γ can be significant.

Estimation of γ with unknown σ using (4.3) and (4.5)

In these experiments, we used simulated process with $\gamma = 0.6$ and estimates (4.3) and (4.5).

For solution of equation (4.3) and optimization problem (4.5), we used simple search over a finite set $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^N = \{k/N\}_{k=1}^N$. We used $N = 300$ for (4.3) and $N = 30$ for (4.5). Further increasing of N does not improve the results but slows down calculation.

It appears that estimation of γ is more numerically challenging than estimation of σ using (4.1) with known γ. In our experiments, we observed that the dependence of the value of criterion function in (4.5) depends on h smoothly and the dependence on h for each particular Monte-Carlo trial is represented by an U-shaped smooth convex function. However, the minimum point of this functions is deviating significantly for different Monte-Carlo trials, especially in the case of low-frequency sampling. It requires high-frequency sampling to reduce the error $\widehat{\gamma} - \gamma$. Table 6.2 shows the parameters of the error $\widehat{\gamma} - \gamma$. We found that these parameters are quite robust with respect to the change of other parameters of simulated process.

Estimation of σ using (4.5)

The solution of optimization problem (4.5) gives an estimate of σ, in addition to an estimate of γ, in the setting with unknown σ, via (4.6). This gives a method for estimation of σ tat can be an alternative to estimator (4.1). Table 6.3 shows the parameters of the error $\widehat{\sigma} - \sigma$. It appears that the RMSE is larger than for estimators (4.1) applied with a correct $h = \gamma$ and has the same order as the RMSE for this estimators applied with $h \neq \gamma$, i.e., if γ is "miscalculated".

(a) $\delta = 1/52$

	$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\,\lvert\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\rvert^2}$	$\mathbb{E}\,\lvert\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\rvert$	$\mathbb{E}\,(\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma)$
$\gamma = 0.5,\ h = 0.5$	0.0312	0.0248	0.0034
$\gamma = 0.4,\ h = 0.5$	0.0458	0.0365	0.0281
$\gamma = 0.6,\ h = 0.5$	0.0358	0.0290	-0.0183
$\gamma = 0.7,\ h = 0.5$	0.0495	0.0413	-0.0370

(b) $\delta = 1/250$

	$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\,\lvert\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\rvert^2}$	$\mathbb{E}\,\lvert\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\rvert$	$\mathbb{E}\,(\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma)$
$\gamma = 0.5,\ h = 0.5$	0.0136	0.0109	0.0006
$\gamma = 0.4,\ h = 0.5$	0.0328	0.0272	0.0259
$\gamma = 0.6,\ h = 0.5$	0.0269	0.0227	-0.0215
$\gamma = 0.7,\ h = 0.5$	0.0468	0.0416	-0.0414

Table 6.1: Parameters of the error $\widehat{\sigma} - \sigma$ for $\widehat{\sigma}$ obtained from estimates (4.1) with $\delta = 1/52$ and $\delta = 1/250$. In the first column, γ is the "true" power used for simulation, and h is the parameter of (4.1) used for estimation; mismatching of γ and h leads to a larger bias and a larger estimation error.

Comparison with the performance of other metods

Sørensen (2000) and Zhou (2001) reported the results of testing of a variety of estimators based on the maximum likelihood method or the method of moments for special cases of (2.1). These works considered simulated processes with a preselected structure for the drift term with a low dimension of the vector of parameters. Due to numerical challenges for the methods used, the number of Monte Carlo trials was relatively short in these works (100 trials in Sørensen (2000) and 1,000 trials in Zhou (2001)). Sørensen (2000) considered model (2.3) with one fixed set of parameters (a, b) for the drift, and Zhou (2001) considered model (2.2) for a variety of the parameters (a, b) for the drift. Sørensen (2000) considered estimation of (σ, γ) and estimation of the drift parameters, and Zhou (2001) considered estimation of σ and estimation of the drift parameters with fixed $\gamma = 1/2$.

The results for σ in Table 5 from Zhou (2001) reported for $\delta = 1/500$ depends significantly on the choice of the the drift parameters (a, b) in (2.2) (in our notations). The minimal RMSE for estimates of σ among all pairs (a, b) is of the same order as the RMSE reported in our Table

	$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left\|\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\right\|^2}$ for (4.3)	$\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\|$ for (4.3)	$\mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\right)$ for (4.3)	$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left\|\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\right\|^2}$ for (4.5)	$\mathbb{E}\left\|\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\right\|$ for (4.5)	$\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma)$ for (4.5)
$\delta = 1/250$	0.2078	0.1736	0.1078	0.2304	0.1946	0.1166
$\delta = 1/10,000$	0.0309	0.0182	0.0039	0.0356	0.0221	0.0042
$\delta = 1/20,000$	0.0222	0.0109	0.0020	0.0483	0.0294	0.0004

Table 6.2: Parameters of the error $\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma$ for the solution of (4.3) and (4.5) with an unknown σ.

	$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left\|\widehat{\sigma}-\sigma\right\|^2}$	$\mathbb{E}\left\|\widehat{\sigma}-\sigma\right\|$	$\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\sigma}-\sigma)$
$\delta = 1/250$	0.0515	0.0264	0.0092
$\delta = 1/10,000$	0.0063	0.0038	0.0001
$\delta = 1/20,000$	0.0168	0.0108	0.00003

Table 6.3: Parameters of the error $\widehat{\sigma}-\sigma$ for $\widehat{\sigma}$ obtained from (4.6) and (4.5) with an unknown γ.

6.1(a) for $\delta = 1/250$ for the case of known h; for other choices of the drift the RMSE in Table 5 from Zhou (2001) is much larger. Remind that RMSE is smaller for smaller δ.

The RMSE for σ reported in Table II.1 from Sørensen (2000) for $\delta = 1/500$ (in our notations) is approximately the same as in Table 6.3 for $\delta = 1/250$. However, the RMSE for γ with $\delta = 1/500$ is three times smaller in Table II.1 from Sørensen (2000) for some estimators than in Table 6.2 with $\delta = 1/250$. However, it may happen that the performance of the estimators in Table II.1 from Sørensen (2000) is not robust with respect to different choices of the drift parameters, similarly to the case presented in Table 5 from Zhou (2001) for $\gamma = 1/2$. On the other hand, our method allowed to include a high variety of drift models with almost unlimited dimension, and, as we found in some unreported experiments, the choice of particular drifts does not have an impact on the performance of the estimator.

7 On the consistency of the method

Let us describe briefly the consistency of the method. Clearly, one cannot the real life data such as market prices are generated by model (2.1). Hence we restrict our consideration by the error for simulated data. The equations in the continuous time used for our method are

exact and hold almost surely for continuous time underlying processes (2.1). Therefore, the only source of the error is the time discretization error. This error is inevitable since the the method requires pathwise evaluation of stochastic integrals. Let us discuss briefly consistency of the method as convergence of the estimates to the true values as the sampling frequency is increasing, i.e. $\delta \to 0$. A rigorous analysis of convergency for the time discretization requires significant analytical efforts outside of the scope of this paper; see e.g. Kloeden and Platen (1992) and Jourdain and Kohatsu-Higa (2011), where review of the recent literature can be found. We leave this analysis for the future research and give below a short sketch of two possible approaches.

There are two options. First, one can consider Euler-Maruyama time discretization for the pair (y, Y_h) such as described for the numerical experiments described above. In this case, f and the sampling frequency δ have to be such that a satisfactory approximation is achieved. In particular, by Theorem 9.6.2 from Kloeden and Platen (1992), p. 324, these conditions are satisfied for CIR models as well as for the case where $f(y(\cdot), t) = f(y(t), t)$. Some analysis o and conditions for the convergence in more general cases can be found in Jourdain and Kohatsu-Higa (2011). The numerical experiments described above demonstrate that the required convergence takes place for equtations will delay modelled there.

Another option is to consider convergence of the method for $\delta \to 0$ given that $\mathcal{Y}(t_k)$ are constructed with the "true" entries $y(t)$. We presume here that it is possible to produce an arbitrarily close approximation of a continuous path $y(t)$ via Monte-Carlo simulation with increasing of the simulation frequency. Let $t_\delta(t)$ be selected as t_k such that $|t - t_k| = \min_p |t - t_p|$ (for certainty, let it me the minimal point if t is in the middle of a sampling interval). Clearly, $\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\in[0,\tau]} |y(t_\delta(t)) - y(t)|^2 \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$. Hence $\delta \sum_{k=m_0+1}^{m} y(t_k)^{2(\gamma-h)} \to \int_\theta^\tau y(s)^{2(\gamma-h)} ds$ in probability as $\delta \to 0$. Further, can be shown that $\log |\mathcal{Y}_h(t_\delta(t))| \to \log |Y_h(t)|$ in probability as $\delta \to 0$. This leads to converges of estimates to their true values in probability.

8 Discussion

(i). The estimates listed in Section 4 do not use neither f nor the probability distribution of the process $\{y(t)\}$. In particular, they are invariant with respect to the choice of an equivalent probability measure. This is an attractive feature that allows to consider models with a large number of parameters for the drift.

(ii). It appears that estimation of the power index γ with unknown σ is numerically challenging and requires high-frequency sampling to reduce the error. Perhaps, this can be improved using other modifications of (4.5) and other estimates for the degree of nonlinearity for the implementation of Lemma 4.2. In particular, the standard criterions of linearity for the first order regressions could be used, and L_2-type criterions could be replaced by L_p-type criterions with $p \neq 2$. So far, we were unable to find a way to reduce the error for lower sampling frequency. We leave it for the future research.

(iii). Our approach does not cover the estimation of the drift f which is a more challenging problem. However, the estimates for (σ, γ) suggested above can be used to simplify statistical inference for f by reduction of the dimension of the numerical problems arising in the maximum likelihood method, methods of moments, or least squares estimators, for (f, σ, γ). This can be illustrated as the following.

Assume that $\gamma = 1/2$ is given and that evolution of $y(t)$ is described by Cox-Ingersoll-Ross equation (2.2) with $\theta = 0$. It is known that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}y(T) &= b(1 - e^{-aT}) + e^{-aT}y(0), \\ \operatorname{Var} y(T) &= \frac{\sigma^2}{2a}b(1 - e^{-aT}) + e^{-aT}\frac{\sigma^2}{a^2}(1 - e^{-aT})y(0). \end{aligned}$$

(See, e.g., Gourieroux and Monfort (2013)). This system can be solved with respect to (a, b) given that $\mathbf{E}y(T)$ and $\operatorname{Var} y(T)$ are estimated by their sampling values, and σ is estimated as suggested above.

(iv). The paper focuses on the case where $\sigma(t)$ is constant. However, some results can be extended on the case of time depending and random $\sigma(t)$. For example, the proofs given above imply that $\int_\theta^{t_m} \sigma(s)^2 ds$ can be estimated as

$$\widetilde{\sigma}^2_{\gamma,\gamma} = \sum_{k=m_0+1}^{m} \log(1 + \eta^2_{\gamma,k}).$$

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges support provided by ARC grant of Australia DP120100928.

References

[1] Ait-Sahalia, Y. (1996). Nonparametric pricing of interest rate derivative securities, *Econometrica* 64, 527–560.

[2] Andersen, T.G., Lund, J. (1997). Estimating continuous-time stochastic volatility models of the short-term interest rate. *Journal of Econometrics* 77 (1997) 343–377.

[3] Carr, P. and Sun, J. (2007). A new approach for option pricing under stochastic volatility. *Review of Derivatives Research* **10**, 87–250.

[4] Chan, K.C., Karolyi, G.A., Longstaff, F.A., Sanders, A.B. (1992). An empirical investigation of alternative models of the short-term interest rate, *J. Finance*, 47, 1209-1227.

[5] De Rossi, G. (2010). Maximum likelihood estimation of the Cox-Ingersoll-Ross model using particle filters. *Computational Economics* **36**, Iss. 1, 1–16.

[6] Dokuchaev, N. (2014). Volatility estimation from short time series of stock prices. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* **26** (2), pp. 373–384.

[7] Fan, J., Jiang, J., Zhang, Z. and Zhou, Z. (2003). Time-dependent diffusion models for term structure dynamics. *Statistica Sinica* 13, 965-992.

[8] Fergusson, K., and Platen, E. (2015). Application of maximum likelihood estimation to stochastic short rate models. *Annals of Financial Economics* **10**, 1550009 (26 pages).

[9] Gibbons, M.R., and Ramaswamy, K. (1993). A test of the Cox, Ingersoll, and Ross model of the term structure. *Review of Financial Studies* **6**, iss.3, 619–658.

[10] Gourieroux, C., and Monfort, A. (2013). Pitfalls in the estimation of continuous time interest rate models: the case of the CIR Model. *Annals of Economics and Statistics*, No. 109/110, 25–61.

[11] Heston, S. (1993). Closed-form solution for options with stochastic volatility, with applicationto bond and currency options. *Review of Financial Studies* **6**(2), 327–343.

[12] Hin, Lin-Yee and Dokuchaev N. (2016). Short rate forecasting based on the inference from the CIR model for multiple yield curve dynamics. *Annals of Financial Economics* 11, 1650004 (33 pages).

[13] Iacus, S.M. (2008). *Simulation and Inference for Stochastic Differential Equations With R Examples.* Springer.

[14] Kessler, M. (1997). Estimation of an ergodic diffusion from discrete observations. Scand. J. Statist. 24, 211-229.

[15] Kloeden, P. E., Platen, E. (1992). Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations. Berlin etc., Springer-Verlag.

[16] Lewis, A. L. (2000). *Option valuation under stochastic volatility.* Finance Press, Newport Beach, California, USA.

[17] Luong, C. and Dokuchaev, N. (2016). Modelling dependency of volatility on sampling frequency via delay equations. *Annals of Financial Economics,* Vol. 11, No. 2 (June 2016) 1650007 (21 pages).

[18] Søorensen (2000). *Inference for Diffusion Processes and Stochastic Volatility Models.* Ph.D. thesis. University of Copenhagen. Denmark.

[19] Stoica, G. (2005). A stochastic delay financial model. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 133(6), 1837-1841.

[20] Zhou, H. (2001). Finite Sample Properties of EMM, GMM, QMLE, and MLE for a Square-Root Interest Rate Diffusion Model. *Journal of Computational Finance* **2**, 89-122.